DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 400 913 JC 960 686

AUTHOR Payne, William H., Jr.; Griffith, Cynthia W.
TITLE Employer Survey Results for the PVCC Graduating Class of 1993-94. Research Report No. 3-96.
INSTITUTION Piedmont Virginia Community Coll., Charlottesville, VA. Office of Institutional Research and Planning.
PUB DATE Nov 96
NOTE 42p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; *Employer Attitudes; Graduate Surveys; *Job Performance; *Job Skills; *Personnel Evaluation; *School Effectiveness; Two Year Colleges; Vocational Evaluation; Vocational Followup
IDENTIFIERS *Piedmont Virginia Community College

ABSTRACT

As part of a follow-up of 1993-94 graduates, Piedmont Virginia Community College (PVCC) conducted a study of graduates' employers to determine their satisfaction with graduates' job skills, performance, and academic preparation. Surveys were sent to 43 employers of graduates who were not self-employed and who gave permission for their employers to be contacted. Study findings, based on responses from 31 employers, included the following: (1) over 70% of the respondents rated PVCC graduates as either excellent or good in six job performance categories (i.e., technical job skills, quality of work, quantity of work, attitude, cooperation with other employees, and cooperation with supervisors); (2) compared to findings from a 1992-93 survey, however, the proportion of graduates receiving excellent or good ratings in the six categories decreased slightly; (3) PVCC graduates were also rated as either excellent or good by over 70% of the employers with respect to five general skills (i.e., math, writing, speaking, research, and logic); (4) graduates' general skills ratings increased from the previous year; and (5) 84% of employers rated PVCC as either excellent or good with respect to occupational training, while 84.6% did so with respect to general education. Appendixes provide tables of employer evaluations by graduate curricular program and degree received, employer comments, lists of graduates' job titles and participating employers, the employer contact authorization form, and the survey instrument. (TGI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 400 913

Employer Survey Results for the PVCC Graduating Class of 1993-94

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. B. Head

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Research Report No. 3-96
November 1996

Piedmont Virginia Community College
Charlottesville, Virginia

William H. Payne, Jr. (Author)
Institutional Research and Planning Associate
and
Cynthia W. Griffith (Author)
Institutional Research and Planning Intern
Piedmont Virginia Community College

JC 960 080

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EMPLOYER SURVEY RESULTS FOR THE PVCC GRADUATING CLASS OF 1993-94

William H. Payne
Institutional Research and Planning Associate
and
Cynthia W. Griffith
Institutional Research and Planning Intern
Piedmont Virginia Community College

Office of Institutional Research and Planning
Piedmont Virginia Community College
Charlottesville, Virginia 22902
Research Report No. 3-96

November 1996

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Methodology 2

Employer Evaluation of Job Performance 3

Employer Evaluation of General Skills 8

Employer Evaluation of Training and Education at PVCC 10

Conclusions 11

Appendix A: Employer Evaluations by Curricular Program and Degree Received 13

Appendix B: Employer Comments 27

Appendix C: Job Titles of PVCC Graduates Whose Employers Completed Surveys . . 31

Appendix D: Participating Employers 35

Appendix E: Employer Contact Authorization Form 39

Appendix F: Survey Instrument 43

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: Work Evaluation of 1993-94 PVCC Graduates by Employers 4

TABLE 2: Correlation Between Job Satisfaction and Employer Evaluation 7

TABLE 3: General Skills Evaluation of 1993-94 PVCC Graduates by Employers 8

TABLE 4: Evaluation of PVCC by Employers of 1993-94 PVCC Graduates 10

TABLE 5: Evaluation of Technical Job Skills by Program and Degree 15

TABLE 6: Evaluation of Quality of Work by Program and Degree 16

TABLE 7: Evaluation of Quantity of Work by Program and Degree 17

TABLE 8: Evaluation of Attitude Toward Work by Program and Degree 18

TABLE 9: Evaluation of Cooperation with Fellow Workers by Program and Degree . . . 19

TABLE 10: Evaluation of Cooperation with Supervisors by Program and Degree 20

TABLE 11: Evaluation of Math Skills by Program and Degree 21

TABLE 12: Evaluation of Writing Skills by Program and Degree 22

TABLE 13: Evaluation of Speaking Skills by Program and Degree 23

TABLE 14: Evaluation of Research Skills by Program and Degree 24

TABLE 15: Evaluation of Logic Skills by Program and Degree 25

EMPLOYER SURVEY RESULTS FOR THE PVCC GRADUATING CLASS OF 1993-94

INTRODUCTION

This report is the tenth in a series of annual studies on employer satisfaction with Piedmont Virginia Community College (PVCC) graduates.[1] For many students, the primary purpose of a college education is to obtain a particular job and attain success in that job. Many academic programs are designed to secure jobs for students in technical fields or to upgrade occupational skills. Graduate follow-up surveys, skills tests, and a number of other tools are available for measurement purposes, but ultimately an employer's satisfaction or dissatisfaction determines occupational success for both the graduate and the academic program. At a time when state legislatures, accrediting agencies, and state coordinating boards are

---

[1]See Ronald B. Head, *Employer Survey Results for the PVCC Graduating Class of 1984-1985* (PVCC Research Report No. 5-87, June 1987), Ronald B. Head, *Employer Survey Results for the PVCC Graduating Class of 1985-1986* (PVCC Research Report No. 6-88, July 1988), Ronald B. Head, *Employer Survey Results for the PVCC Graduating Class of 1986-1987* (PVCC Research Report No. 5-89, July 1989), Ronald B. Head, *Employer Survey Results for the PVCC Graduating Class of 1987-88* (PVCC Research Report No. 4-90, June 1990), Ronald B. Head, *Employer Survey Results for the PVCC Graduating Class of 1988-89* (PVCC Research Report No. 5-91, August 1991), Ronald B. Head, *Employer Survey Results for the PVCC Graduating Class of 1989-90* (PVCC Research Report No. 2-92, February 1992), Ronald B. Head, *Employer Survey Results for the PVCC Graduating Class of 1990-91* (PVCC Research Report No. 3-93, April 1993), Richard S. Myers, *Employer Survey Results for the PVCC Graduating Class of 1991-92* (PVCC Research Report No. 6-93, November 1993), William H. Payne, Jr., *Employer Survey Results for the PVCC Graduating Class of 1992-93* (PVCC Research Report No. 1-95, February 1995). Prior to 1987, PVCC had conducted two employer surveys, one in 1976, and one in 1980. Results of the 1980 survey, conducted by Robert A. Ross, were published in *Employer Follow-Up on the Occupational/Technical Graduates of the Class of 1978-1979* (PVCC Research Report No. 3-80, October 1980). Between 1980 and 1987, employer surveys were not conducted because college officials feared such surveys might violate the privacy rights of graduates.

demanding student outcomes assessment, employer evaluations are extremely important for all institutions of higher education.

METHODOLOGY

To protect the privacy of its graduates, PVCC surveys only employers of graduates who have given permission on a graduate follow-up survey to conduct an employer survey. Although this limits the number of employers who can be contacted, as well as raises the possibility of a self-selection bias, the privacy rights of PVCC graduates must be ensured.

On the graduate follow-up survey for the class of 1993-94, 59 graduates, or 52.2% of all respondents, answered yes to the question "May we contact your employer to conduct an employer follow-up survey?" On November 9, 1995, survey forms were sent to the employers of 43 of these graduates. Surveys were not sent to employers of sixteen graduates who were either self-employed or provided no employer address. Thirty-one of the 43 employers completed and returned valid surveys for a response rate of 72.9%. This response rate was somewhat lower than last year's survey but was higher than the response rate from the previous survey (80.5% for 1992-93 and 53.1% for 1991-92 graduates).

Results of the employer survey by PVCC instructional program and degree are included in this study as Appendix A, and employer comments are included as Appendix B. A list of the job titles of PVCC graduates whose employers completed

surveys is included as Appendix C, and a list of all participating employers is included as Appendix D. The release form is included as Appendix E and the survey instrument as Appendix F.

EMPLOYER EVALUATION OF JOB PERFORMANCE

The evaluation of 1993-94 PVCC graduates by their employers with respect to job skills, performance, and attitude is presented in Table 1. As can be seen, over 70% of employers rated PVCC graduates as either EXCELLENT (one of the best ever) or GOOD (better than most) in every category. Over half of the employers rated PVCC graduates as EXCELLENT in four categories—"Quality of Work," "Attitude Towards Work," "Cooperation with Fellow Workers,"and "Cooperation with Supervisors."[2] More than 20% of employers rated PVCC graduates as AVERAGE (about the same as most) in three categories—"Technical Job Skills," "Quality of Work," and "Quantity of Work." Finally, one employer rated a PVCC graduate as POOR (worse than most) in the categories "Quality of Work" and "Quantity of Work," while another employer rated a different PVCC graduate as POOR in the categories "Cooperation with Co-Workers" and "Cooperation with Supervisors."

[2]Nearly half of employers rated PVCC graduates as GOOD in the "Technical Job Skills" category.

Table 1
Work Evaluation of 1993-94 PVCC Graduates by Employers

Category	Excellent		Good		Average		Poor	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Technical Job Skills	8	25.8%	14	45.2%	9	29.0%	0	0.0%
Quality of Work	16	51.6%	7	22.6%	7	22.6%	1	3.2%
Quantity of Work	13	43.3%	8	26.7%	8	26.7%	1	3.3%
Attitude Toward Work	19	61.3%	8	25.8%	4	12.9%	0	0.0%
Cooperation with Fellow Workers	16	51.6%	11	35.5%	3	9.7%	1	3.2%
Cooperation with Supervisors	19	61.3%	8	25.8%	3	9.7%	1	3.2%

An examination of the 1993-94 ratings in comparison to those given for 1992-93 and 1991-92 graduates reveals several trends regarding work evaluation. All categories exhibited notable decreases in the proportion of employers who rated PVCC graduates as either EXCELLENT or GOOD. Over the three-year period, the proportion of graduates receiving either an EXCELLENT or a GOOD rating in "Technical Job Skills" dropped from 81.3% to 71.0%. "Quality of Work" ratings decreased from 87.9% to 74.2%. Graduates receiving EXCELLENT or GOOD ratings in the category "Quantity of Work" decreased from 78.8% to 70.0%. EXCELLENT or GOOD ratings also decreased in the category "Attitude Toward Work" from 100% for 1992-93 graduates to 87.1% for 1993-94 graduates. "Cooperation with Fellow Workers" decreased from 93.9% (1992-93) to 87.1%

(1993-94) while "Cooperation with Supervisors" decreased from 100% (1992-93) to 87.1% (1993-94). Overall, the proportion of graduates receiving EXCELLENT or GOOD ratings in the six categories decreased to around 79% for 1993-94 graduates after steadily increasing in previous years (87.2% in 1991-92; and 88.8% in 1992-93). Care should be taken in interpreting these figures, however, due to the small number of 1993-94 employer survey respondents.

Of the 31 graduates whose employers returned valid surveys, 51.6% (16) indicated on the graduate follow-up survey that they intended to pursue their current jobs as long-range careers, 22.6% (7) indicated they did not plan to pursue their current position long-term, and 25.8% (8) were undecided. For the most part, these graduates were more likely to want to pursue their current jobs as long-range careers than were other graduate survey respondents. Slightly over 40% (46) of all graduate survey respondents indicated that they planned to pursue their current positions long-term, while 27.4% (31) indicated they would not, and 14.1% (16) were undecided. Overall, the proportion of graduates indicating that they intended to pursue their current positions as long-term careers has steadily decreased over a three-year period (80.0% in 1991-92; 65.6% in 1992-93; and 51.6% in 1993-94).

On the graduate follow-up survey, 41.9% (13) of the graduates whose employers returned surveys indicated that they were very satisfied with their jobs, 48.4% (15) indicated they were satisfied, and 3.2% (1) were not very satisfied, and 3.2% (1) were unsatisfied. One graduate surveyed did not answer this question. Percentage figures for all respondents to the graduate follow-up survey

were lower for those graduates claiming they were very satisfied and higher for those claiming they were not very satisfied or dissatisfied. Approximately 25.7% (29) of all respondents indicated that they were very satisfied, 44.2% (50) indicated they were satisfied, 6.2% (7) were not very satisfied, and 5.3% (6) were dissatisfied.

As noted earlier, surveying employers only with prior permission from PVCC graduates may have biased the survey results. One might assume that satisfied, productive workers are more likely than unsatisfied, unproductive workers to allow their employers to be contacted. Indeed, 1993-94 graduate survey data suggest that graduates who granted PVCC permission to contact their employers had higher levels of job satisfaction than did survey respondents in general. Whereas 69.9% of all graduates surveyed were either satisfied or very satisfied with their jobs, 90.3% of the graduates who allowed PVCC to contact their employers were satisfied or very satisfied with their jobs. The possibility that results of the survey were biased by the selection procedure is a valid concern.

To investigate this further, correlation coefficients were calculated between each of the categories in Table 1 and the job satisfaction of PVCC graduates. The results are presented in Table 2.

For the most part, neither statistically significant positive nor negative correlations between job satisfaction and employer evaluations were evident. The variables exhibiting the highest degrees of correlation with job satisfaction were "Cooperation with Fellow Workers," "Cooperation with Supervisors," and "Attitude Toward Work." None of the coefficients were significant at the .05 level. The lowest correlation was between job satisfaction and "Technical Job Skills." These results suggest little relationship between job satisfaction and employer evaluations of PVCC graduates. However, because employer ratings of PVCC graduate job skills, performance, and attitudes tend to be high regardless of the level of graduate job satisfaction, care should be exercised in interpreting these results. The existence of relatively small variances in the employer ratings may be the reason for the low correlation coefficients rather than lack of relationship between independent and dependent variables.

Table 2
Correlation Between Job Satisfaction And Employer Evaluation

Category	Correlation Coefficient
Technical Job Skills	-0.02185
Quality of Work	0.05243
Quantity of Work	0.12098
Attitude Toward Work	0.15492
Cooperation with Fellow Workers	0.22160
Cooperation with Supervisors	0.15823

NOTE: The correlation coefficient in this table was calculated using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation. Measures of correlation are typically defined as having values ranging from -1 to +1. A value of -1 indicates a perfect negative relation, while a value of +1 indicates a perfect positive relation.

EMPLOYER EVALUATION OF GENERAL SKILLS

Table 3 presents the evaluation of general skills given by employers to 1993-94 PVCC graduates. Employers evaluated general skills in math, writing, speaking, research, and logic. Overall, employers felt that PVCC graduates had better general skills than most employees. Over 70% of employers rated PVCC graduates as either EXCELLENT or GOOD in every general skills category. No PVCC graduates were rated by their employers as POOR in any of these skills.

Table 3
General Skills Evaluation of 1993-94 PVCC Graduates by Employers

	Excellent		Good		Average		Poor	
Category	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Math Skills	8	33.3%	11	45.8%	5	20.8%	0	0.0%
Writing Skills	9	32.1%	12	42.9%	7	25.0%	0	0.0%
Speaking Skills	9	30.0%	14	46.7%	7	23.3%	0	0.0%
Research Skills	6	28.6%	9	42.9%	6	28.6%	0	0.0%
Logic Skills	10	32.3%	12	38.7%	9	29.0%	0	0.0%

In all general skills categories, a slightly larger percentage of 1993-94 graduate employers rated their employees as EXCELLENT than did 1992-93 graduate employers. However, due to the small number of employer respondents,

caution should be exercised in drawing any conclusions from this. For example, while the number of graduates receiving EXCELLENT ratings in research skills dropped from 31.8% in 1992-93 to 28.6% in 1993-94, this decrease represented a decline of only 2 persons.

In 1993-94, graduates received a larger percentage of EXCELLENT or GOOD ratings in four categories—"Math Skills" (76.0% in 1992-93; 79.1% in 1993-94); "Writing Skills" (63.7% in 1992-93; 75.0% in 1993-94); "Speaking Skills" (66.7% in 1992-93; 76.7% in 1993-94); and "Research Skills" (68.2% in 1992-93; 71.5% in 1993-94). Only one category witnessed a decrease in the percentage of students receiving either an EXCELLENT or GOOD rating—"Logic Skills" (75.7% in 1992-93; 71.0% in 1993-94). After suffering a decrease the previous year (76.0% in 1992-93 down from 80.0% in 1991-92), the category "Math Skills" rebounded in 1993-94 (79.1%) to record the highest percentage of EXCELLENT or GOOD ratings.

Employer evaluations of 1993-94 PVCC graduates by both curricular program and degree, as well as by skills in math, writing, speaking, research, and logic, are presented in Tables 11 through 15 of Appendix A.[3] Again, as noted earlier, care should be exercised in interpreting figures from any table in Appendix A. In many cases, the numbers of respondents are too few for meaningful conclusions to be drawn.

---

[3]No returned 1993-94 employer surveys included any graduates who had received certificates.

EMPLOYER EVALUATION OF TRAINING AND EDUCATION AT PVCC

Employers were asked to rate PVCC according to two categories: (1) "Occupational Education and Training;" and (2) "General Education." The results of this evaluation are shown in Table 4.

Table 4
Evaluation of PVCC by Employers of 1993-94 PVCC Graduates

	Excellent		Good		Average		Poor	
Category	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Occupational Education and Training	7	28.0%	14	56.0%	3	12.0%	1	4.0%
General Education	7	26.9%	15	57.7%	3	11.5%	1	13.8%

The majority of employers felt that PVCC was better than most institutions with respect both to occupational education and training and to general education. Occupational education and training at PVCC was rated as EXCELLENT or GOOD by 84.0% of the employers, and general education was rated as either EXCELLENT or GOOD by 84.6%. Although the percentage for occupational education and training shows a slight decrease (down 0.6% from 84.6% in 1992-93), the percentage for general education represents an increase over the previous year's figure (up 1.2% from 83.4% in 1992-93). Smaller percentages of 1993-94

employers rated PVCC as EXCELLENT in the two categories. One employer rated both occupational education and training and general education as POOR, and less than 20% rated either as AVERAGE.

CONCLUSIONS

The primary purpose of PVCC employer surveys is to determine employer satisfaction or dissatisfaction with graduate job skills, performance, and academic preparation. Such surveys are important because they enable college officials to gauge the success of academic programs. For the most part, employers were satisfied with the performance and general skills of the 1993-94 PVCC graduates they hired, as well as with the training and education provided by PVCC.

Employers gave the job performance of PVCC graduates high ratings. While ratings of EXCELLENT or GOOD concerning job skills, quality and quantity of work, attitude, and cooperation with fellow workers and supervisors have decreased slightly from 1992-93, ratings of the general skills (math, writing, speaking, research and logic) of 1993-94 PVCC graduates increased from the previous year. Overall, the majority of employers felt that 1993-94 PVCC graduates had better general skills than most employees. These results are consistent with general-skills evaluations of prior surveys.

Finally, employers seemed very satisfied with the education and training provided by PVCC. Approximately 84% of employers rated the college as either

EXCELLENT or GOOD in the categories "Occupational Training and Education" and "General Education."

APPENDIX A:

EMPLOYER EVALUATIONS BY

CURRICULAR PROGRAM AND DEGREE RECEIVED

Table 5
Evaluation of Technical Job Skills by Program and Degree

	Excellent		Good		Average		Poor	
Program/Degree	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Liberal Arts	2	50.0%	2	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
AA Degree	2	50.0%	2	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Business Admin.	1	33.3%	2	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Education	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
General Studies	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Science	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%
AS Degree	2	28.6%	3	42.9%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%
Accounting	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Computer Info.	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Management	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Marketing	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Nursing	1	9.1%	4	36.4%	6	54.5%	0	0.0%
Police Science	1	25.0%	2	50.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%
AAS Degree	4	20.0%	9	45.0%	7	35.0%	0	0.0%
Total	8	25.8%	14	45.2%	9	29.0%	0	0.0%

Table 6
Evaluation of Quality of Work by Program and Degree

	Excellent		Good		Average		Poor	
Program/Degree	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Liberal Arts	3	75.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
AA Degree	3	75.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Business Admin.	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Education	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
General Studies	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Science	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%
AS Degree	4	57.1%	1	14.3%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%
Accounting	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Computer Info.	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Management	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Marketing	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Nursing	4	36.4%	2	18.2%	4	36.4%	1	9.1%
Police Science	2	50.0%	1	25.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%
AAS Degree	9	45.0%	5	25.0%	5	25.0%	1	5.0%
Total	16	51.6%	7	22.6%	7	22.6%	1	3.2%

Table 7
Evaluation of Quantity of Work by Program and Degree

	Excellent		Good		Average		Poor	
Program/Degree	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Liberal Arts	3	75.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
AA Degree	3	75.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Business Admin.	1	33.3%	2	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Education	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
General Studies	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Science	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%
AS Degree	3	42.9%	2	28.6%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%
Accounting	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Computer Info.	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Management	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Marketing	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Nursing	3	30.0%	2	20.0%	4	40.0%	1	10.0%
Police Science	1	25.0%	1	25.0%	2	50.0%	0	0.0%
AAS Degree	7	36.8%	5	26.3%	6	31.6%	1	5.3%
Total	13	43.3%	8	26.7%	8	26.7%	1	3.3%

Table 8
Evaluation of Work Attitude by Program and Degree

	Excellent		Good		Average		Poor	
Program/Degree	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Liberal Arts	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
AA Degree	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Business Admin.	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Education	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
General Studies	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Science	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%
AS Degree	5	71.4%	0	0.0%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%
Accounting	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Computer Info.	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Management	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Marketing	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Nursing	4	36.4%	5	45.5%	2	18.2%	0	0.0%
Police Science	2	50.0%	1	25.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%
AAS Degree	10	50.0%	7	35.0%	3	15.0%	0	0.0%
Total	19	61.3%	7	22.6%	5	16.1%	0	0.0%

Table 9
Evaluation of Cooperation with Co-workers by Program and Degree

Program/Degree	Excellent		Good		Average		Poor	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Liberal Arts	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
AA Degree	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Business Admin.	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Education	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
General Studies	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Science	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
AS Degree	4	57.1%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%
Accounting	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Computer Info.	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Management	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Marketing	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Nursing	3	27.3%	5	45.5%	3	27.3%	0	0.0%
Police Science	2	50.0%	2	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
AAS Degree	8	40.0%	9	45.0%	3	15.0%	0	0.0%
Total	16	51.6%	11	35.5%	3	9.7%	1	3.2%

Table 10
Evaluation of Cooperation with Supervisors by Program and Degree

	Excellent		Good		Average		Poor	
Program/Degree	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Liberal Arts	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
AA Degree	4	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Business Admin.	3	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Education	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
General Studies	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%
Science	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
AS Degree	4	57.1%	2	28.6%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%
Accounting	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Computer Info.	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Management	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Marketing	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Nursing	4	36.4%	4	36.4%	3	27.3%	0	0.0%
Police Science	3	75.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
AAS Degree	11	55.0%	6	30.0%	3	15.0%	0	0.0%
Total	19	61.3%	8	25.8%	3	9.7%	1	3.2%

Table 11
Evaluation of Math Skills by Program and Degree

	Excellent		Good		Average		Poor	
Program/Degree	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Liberal Arts	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
AA Degree	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Business Admin.	1	33.3%	2	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Education	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
General Studies	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Science	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
AS Degree	2	40.0%	2	40.0%	1	20.0%	0	0.0%
Accounting	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Computer Info.	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Management	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Marketing	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Nursing	2	18.2%	5	45.5%	4	36.4%	0	0.0%
Police Science	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
AAS Degree	4	25.0%	8	50.0%	4	25.0%	0	0.0%
Total	8	33.3%	11	45.8%	5	20.8%	0	0.0%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 12
Evaluation of Writing Skills by Program and Degree

	Excellent		Good		Average		Poor	
Program/Degree	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Liberal Arts	2	50.0%	2	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
AA Degree	2	50.0%	2	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Business Admin.	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%
Education	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
General Studies	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Science	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%
AS Degree	1	20.0%	1	20.0%	3	60.0%	0	0.0%
Accounting	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Computer Info.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Management	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Marketing	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Nursing	4	40.0%	4	40.0%	2	20.0%	0	0.0%
Police Science	1	25.0%	2	50.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%
AAS Degree	6	31.6%	9	47.4%	4	21.1%	0	0.0%
Total	9	32.1%	12	42.9%	7	25.0%	0	0.0%

Table 13
Evaluation of Speaking Skills by Program and Degree

	Excellent		Good		Average		Poor	
Program/Degree	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Liberal Arts	2	50.0%	2	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
AA Degree	2	50.0%	2	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Business Admin.	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%
Education	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
General Studies	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Science	0	0.0%	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%
AS Degree	2	28.6%	2	28.6%	3	42.9%	0	0.0%
Accounting	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Computer Info.	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Management	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Marketing	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Nursing	3	30.0%	4	40.0%	3	30.0%	0	0.0%
Police Science	1	25.0%	2	50.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%
AAS Degree	5	26.3%	10	52.6%	4	21.1%	0	0.0%
Total	9	30.0%	14	46.7%	7	23.3%	0	0.0%

Table 14
Evaluation of Research Skills by Program and Degree

	Excellent		Good		Average		Poor	
Program/Degree	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Liberal Arts	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
AA Degree	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Business Admin.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Education	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
General Studies	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Science	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
AS Degree	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%
Accounting	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Computer Info.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Management	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Marketing	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Nursing	1	16.7%	3	50.0%	2	33.3%	0	0.0%
Police Science	0	0.0%	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	0	0.0%
AAS Degree	3	21.4%	7	50.0%	4	28.6%	0	0.0%
Total	6	30.0%	9	45.0%	5	25.0%	0	0.0%

Table 15
Evaluation of Logic Skills by Program and Degree

	Excellent		Good		Average		Poor	
Program/Degree	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Liberal Arts	2	50.0%	2	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
AA Degree	2	50.0%	2	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Business Admin.	1	33.3%	2	66.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Education	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
General Studies	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%
Science	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
AS Degree	3	42.9%	3	42.9%	1	14.3%	0	0.0%
Accounting	1	50.0%	1	50.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Computer Info.	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Management	0	0.0%	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Marketing	1	100.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Nursing	2	18.2%	3	27.3%	6	54.5%	0	0.0%
Police Science	0	0.0%	3	75.0%	1	25.0%	0	0.0%
AAS Degree	5	25.0%	8	40.0%	7	35.0%	0	0.0%
Total	10	32.3%	13	41.9%	8	25.8%	0	0.0%

APPENDIX B:

EMPLOYER COMMENTS

Employer Comments

I found both of the PVCC students that I hired lacking in basic nursing skills. I had to have 3 additional weeks of orientation to provide them with the opportunity to gain confidence in their basic skills prior to starting their unit orientation. I realize that the transition from student to RN is especially difficult in a specialty unit and concessions were made because of this. I felt that both students had unrealistic expectations in terms of shift preference, scheduling options, and basic hospital nursing. On several occasions [PVCC graduate] was counseled regarding clinical decisions, however she did not seem to [be] able to internalize the changes that she needed to make.

[PVCC graduate] has worked very hard to get to the level of the rest of the nursing staff. It takes about a year for a new nursing graduate to get to the level of performing nursing care that is required in todays [sic] market. The patient load on our unit is 5-6 patients with varying levels of care. New graduates have had a hard time adjusting to such a heavy assignment when they have only cared for 1 or 2 patients. [PVCC graduate] has done well but could be better evaluated after about a year.

A nursing degree or license is required for this job. RN's [sic] have to have [a] 2 yr. degree or 3 yr. diploma (minimum). Along with your teaching skills, was [PVCC graduate]'s experience in previous jobs which helps [sic] to get a broader scope of understanding patients and co-workers.

[PVCC graduate] is an exceptional employee. She got an excellent education at PVCC but I think she would be an exceptional employee no matter where she got her education because of the person she is.

[PVCC graduate] resigned from the Department in August '95.

I feel the internship program has benefited the students in their learning experiences and getting a job at [employer's hospital]. I have had two students that did the program and were hired. The student this year will graduate this summer and I think she may apply for a job at [employer's hospital]. The internship seems to help the students become more familiar with hospital and nursing routines and be more comfortable/less anxious when employed. I hope [employer's hopsital] and PVCC will continue offering this program. I also feel having the students work on [employer's unit] has been very beneficial for us and the students. I feel the nursing instructors Corinne Conlon and Honey Fogelgren do a great job and I enjoy them doing their rotations on [employer's unit].

Students need to know that they will be asked to perform a variety of job responsibilities in order to progress. They will have to do them well and with a positive "can-do" attitude. Working smart is valued as much or more than [sic] working hard.

My experience w/ PVCC over the years have been positive. From my perspective PVCC is a quality organization.

[PVCC graduate] is a highly motivated, exceptional employee.

APPENDIX C:

JOB TITLES OF PVCC GRADUATES

WHOSE EMPLOYERS COMPLETED SURVEYS

Job Titles

Accounting Clerk

Administrative Assistant

Child care Worker

Counselor III

Customer Service Specialist

Data Specialist

Executive Secretary

Grants Specialist

Head Coach

Health Physics Technician

Lifeguard

Office Manager

Optical Lab Technician

Optician

P.A.Q.C. Engineer

Police Officer

Program Support Technician

Registered Nurse

Retail Supervisor

32 /33

Sales Associate

Secretary

Security Officer

Service Manager

Service Technician

Senior Cost Estimator

Substitute Teacher

Youth Program Director

APPENDIX D:

PARTICIPATING EMPLOYERS

List of Participating Employer Organizations

Ablemarle County

American Express

Augusta Medical Center

Blue Ridge Hospital

Boone & Company Realtors

Charlottesville Public School System

Charlottesville Parks and Recreation Department

Fresh Fields

General Electric

Martha Jefferson Hospital

Metromedia Company

Morved Farms Security

Pearle Vision

Region Ten Community Service Board

Sperry Marine, Inc.

The University of Virginia

The University of Virginia Health Sciences Center

Virginia Power

Westmoreland Energy, Inc.

YMCA

36 / 37

APPENDIX E:

EMPLOYER CONTACT AUTHORIZATION FORM

PIEDMONT VIRGINIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Employer Contact Authorization Form

Date _____

I, the undersigned, grant permission for Piedmont Virginia Community College (PVCC), from which I recently graduated, to contact my employer for the purpose of conducting an employer survey to determine employer satisfaction with the college, its graduates, and its programs of study. I authorize my employer to complete the employer survey form and return it to PVCC.

I understand that the purpose of the employer survey is educational, that survey results will remain confidential, and that only aggregate, not individual, data will be released by PVCC.

_____
(signature)

Graduate's Name _____

Immediate Supervisor's Name _____

Immediate Supervisor's Title _____

Employer (Company) Name _____

Employer Address _____

_____

Employer Telephone _____

40 / 41

APPENDIX F:

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

1994 Employer Survey
Piedmont Virginia Community College

Scale:

Excellent	= One of the best employed by the company
Good	= Better than most
Average	= About the same as most
Poor	= Worse than most
N/A	= Not applicable

In comparison to other employees you hire at the same level and in the same capacity, [PVCC graduate] rates as:

	EXCELLENT	GOOD	AVERAGE	POOR	N/A
Technical job skills	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Quality of worK	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Quantity of work	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Attitude toward work	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Cooperation with fellow workers	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Cooperation with supervisors	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Math skills	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Writing skills	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Speaking skills	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Research skills	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Logic skills	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Compared to similar institutions, PVCC rates as:

	EXCELLENT	GOOD	AVERAGE	POOR	N/A
Occupational education and training	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
General education	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

1994 Employer Survey
Piedmont Virginia Community College

1. Was the PVCC degree required to obtain this job? _____

2. Was the PVCC degree required to obtain a job promotion? _____

3. Do you participate in PVCC's cooperative education program? _____

   If not, are you interested in learning more about the program? _____

Please use the remainder of this page to make any written comments you think will be helpful to PVCC in evaluating the success of its academic programs and graduates.
Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Comments: